

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/075,832	0	2/12/2002	Kern W. Wong	P05085	9012	
7.	590	06/15/2004		EXAMINER		
Docket Clerk				KOBERT, RUSSELL MARC		
P.O. Drawer 80 Dallas, TX 75				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Dunus, 174 /	3300			2829		
				DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		_	In				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/075,832	WONG, KERN W.					
	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Russell M Kobert	2829					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspond nce addr	ess				
THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli- (1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper repich ich places the applic	ly to a ation in				
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The distance been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortener (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. Insign and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. So 136(a) and the appropriate extensions or (ee MPEP extension fee ension fee under 2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	pecause:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require furtle	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or s	implifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ns.				
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) woul canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed	I amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request f application in condition for allowance because: S		sidered but does NC	T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims v	* * *		and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	S :						
Claim(s) allowed: <i>NONE</i> .							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .			•				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: N/A.							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	v					
10. Other:		Hongo h	examiner				
		AU282	7				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the structure of Sauerland could not operate as intended if the temperature chamber was not "substantially" air tight. Moreover, the term "substantially" does not require the chamber to be completely air tight and does not provide a limit to how much air leakage is permissable to be "substantially" air-tight. The argument that Sauerland lacks any mention or suggestion that the "heating coil" is associable with the chamber to form a substantially air-tight chamber is irrelevant because Applicant has not claimed this limitation in any of claims 1, 7 or 13.